

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated July 25, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on October 25, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 10-20, 33-42, 45-47, 50 and 51 are pending in the application. Claims 10-20, 33-42, 45-47, 50 and 51 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 33-42 and 45 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 33-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. The Examiner suggests that these claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 33-42 to be directed to a computer-readable storage medium. Accordingly, applicants submit that claims 33-42, are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101, and therefore respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-14, 17, 33-37, 40, 45, 47, 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zhou et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0162093, hereinafter, "*Zhou*") in view of *DellaFera et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 5,404,523, hereinafter, "*DellaFera*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or

references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143. The present rejection fails to establish at least the third criteria.

For example, *Zhou*, in view of *DellaFera*, does not teach a method operative in a distributed computing environment having clients and a plurality of servers located across geographically dispersed boundaries, as recited by claim 10. More specifically, these references do not teach a method that includes both a step of receiving a first request from a client, where the first request is a request to invoke a remote procedure call at the server and a step of receiving a second request from the client and where the second request comprises an internationalization context for processing the first request, as recited by claim 10. Claims 33 and 45 recite similar limitation. As claimed, the first and second requests have a particular relationship between one another; namely, the first request is to invoke an RPC call on the server and the second request supplies an internationalization context for processing the first request.

The Examiner relies on *Zhou* as teaching these steps of the method recited by claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner suggests that *Zhou* paragraphs [0065-0074] discloses these steps which the Examiner characterizes as follows:

*Zhou et al* teaches receiving, at a server, a first request from a client, wherein the first request is a request to invoke a remote procedure call at the server (See [page] 6, paragraph [0065-0074] *web page is served and rendered after user's request*); receiving, at the server, a second request from the client, wherein the second request comprises an internationalization context for processing the first request (See page 6, paragraph [0066], *user enters login, password information*), wherein the internationalization context specifies geographically specific parameters set for the client (See page 6, paragraph [0074]; extracting the internationalization context from the second request (See page 6, paragraph [0074], *the compiler extracts the locale-specific elements*).

*Office Action*, p.3. Even if the “*user enters login, password information*” were considered as the second request from the client, it certainly does not disclose the internationalization context for processing the first request as recited in the claim. *Zhou*

Paragraph [0066] relied on by the Examiner as disclosing the "second request from the client, wherein the second request comprises an internationalization context for processing the first request" merely describes information presented on a logon screen. For example, Zhou provides: "The logon screen 406 contains an English textual greeting "Please Log In:", an English textual element "User Name", a first entry field to accept alphabet character strings for the user's name, an English textual element "Password", and a second entry field to accept alphanumeric strings for the user's password. The logon screen 406 also includes an actuatable "Submit" button." Zhou, Paragraph [0066].

*Zhou* then goes on to give an example of HTML source for the logon page. When the logon page is submitted to an "international compiler," "the compiler extracts the locale-specific elements (e.g., language text, etc.) into a resource bundle and replaces the extracted elements in the web page with function calls to the resource bundle." *Zhou*, paragraph [0074]. In other words, when a request for a web-page is received, the passages from *Zhou* describe a process where portions of the web page (e.g., text) are supplied in the appropriate language.

Applicants submit, therefore, that *Zhou* fails to teach "receiving, at the server, a second request from the client, wherein the second request comprises an internationalization context for processing the first request, wherein the internationalization context specifies geographically specific parameters set for the client" as recited in claim 10.

Accordingly, Applicants submit claims 10 and its dependents are allowable and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Further, claims 33 and 45 and their dependents contain limitations similar to claim 10, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as stated above.

Claims 15-16, 18-20, 38-39, 41-42 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zhou* in view of *DellaFera* as applied to claim 10 and 33

above, and further in view of *Levy et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0184308, hereinafter, "*Levy*").

Claim 15-16 and 18-20, depend from claim 10. Claims 38-39 and 41-42 depend from claim 33. Claim 46 depends from claim 45. For all the reasons stated above, independent claims 10, 33, and 45 are believed to be allowable. Applicant submit, therefore, that dependent claims 15-16, 18-20, 38-39, 41-42 and 46 are allowable as well.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

#### Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and  
**S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,**

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

---

Gero G. McClellan  
Registration No. 44,227  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicants